



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/776,229	02/12/2004	Chung-Kun Cho	1567.1062	3260
49455	7590	06/15/2007		
STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP 1400 EYE STREET, NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER WEINER, LAURA S	
			ART UNIT 1745	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/15/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/776,229	Applicant(s) CHO ET AL.	
	Examiner Laura S. Weiner	Art Unit 1745	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16 and 17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 8-15 and 18-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 7 and 22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8-05; 1-07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of the second polymer layer comprising a silicon-included compound and the metal layer comprising a metal from claim 15 in the reply filed on 4-26-07 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that it would not be a burden to search on all the metals. This is not found persuasive because there are different types of metal in regard to where the metals are positioned in the periodically table.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 16-17 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 4-26-07

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-15, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mikhaylik et al. (WO 02/50933).

Mikhaylik et al. teaches on page 4, lines 27-30, Figure 2 shows an anode comprising (a) a polymer film (10) [*a first polymer layer*], (b) a protective crosslinked polymer layer (20) [*a second polymer layer on first polymer layer*], c) a metal current collector layer [*a metal layer on second polymer layer*], (40) and (d) an anode active layer comprising lithium (30) [*a negative active material layer on the metal layer*].

Mikhaylik et al. teaches on page 2, line 25 to page 3, line 2, that the polymer film layer is a polyester film selected from polyethylene terephthalate, etc. and the film has 1-25 um thickness or 2-10 um thickness. Mikhaylik et al. teaches on page 3, lines 3-18, that the protective crosslinked polymer layer is made from monomers and has a thickness of 0.1-4 um or 0.01-0.5 um [*second polymer layer having a thickness of 0.01-10 um; 0.02-7.5 um and 0.03-5 um*] and teaches the metal current collector layer comprises copper or nickel. The active layer comprises lithium from 5-50 um in thickness. Mikhaylik et al. teaches on page 12, that the cathode comprises an electroactive sulfur-containing material comprising a mixture of elemental sulfur and sulfur containing polymer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 2, 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Mikhaylik et al. (WO 02/50933).

Mikhaylik et al. teaches on page 4, lines 27-30, Figure 2 shows an anode comprising (a) a polymer film (10) [*a first polymer layer*], (b) a protective crosslinked polymer layer (20) [*a second polymer layer on first polymer layer*], c) a metal current

Art Unit: 1745

collector layer [a metal layer on second polymer layer], (40) and (d) an anode active layer comprising lithium (30) [a negative active material layer on the metal layer].

. In the event any differences can be shown for the product of the product by process claim 2, as opposed to the product taught by Mikhaylik et al., such differences would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as a routine modification of the product in the absence of a showing of unexpected results. *In re Thrope* 227 USPQ 964; (Fed. Cir. 1985).

With respect to the product by process claim 2, the determination of patentability is based upon the product itself not upon the method of its production. *In re Thrope* 227 USPQ 964; *In re Brown* 173 USPQ 685; *In re Bridgeford* 149 USPQ 55; *In re Wertheim* 191 USPQ 90. Any difference imparted by the product by process limitations would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because where the Examiner has found a substantially similar product as in the applied prior art, the burden of proof is shifted to the Applicants to establish that their product is patentably distinct. *In re Brown* 173 USPQ 685 and *In re Fessmann* 180 USPQ 324.


Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 6-7, 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laura S. Weiner whose telephone number is 571-272-1294. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Laura S Weiner
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1745

June 11, 2007